

Appln No. 10/728,781  
Amdt. Dated August 18, 2004  
Response to Office action of June 22, 2004

4

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The drawings have been rejected under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner has stated that the Figures must show that the corner 23 is actually lower than the other three corners of the support tray.

With respect, Applicant disagrees with this objection. Claim 3 claims : *"The page binding device of claim 1 wherein the tray has a base including at least one corner portion that is lower than other portions of the base"*. When the alignment of Figures 8 to 13 on the page is properly considered, it can be seen that corner 23, shown at the right of the figure, is lower than the unlabelled corner shown at the left of the figure. That is, the tray 18 is depicted as having one corner (corner 23) lower than other portions of the base (unlabelled corner). Thus the features of claim 3 are properly illustrated. The claim does not define a requirement that the corner 23 is the lower point of the tray, ie that it is lower than all other portions of the base. Claim 3 only defines that corner 23 is lower than some other portions of the tray. Applicant respectfully submits that the features of claim 3 are adequately described in the description and adequately illustrated in the Figures.

The drawings have been rejected under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they show reference sign 20' which is not described in the description. Page 8 has been amended to include the reference label 20'.

The specification has been objected to for a range of informalities, which have all been addressed in the amended pages.

The claims stand rejected under 35 USC 112 for failing to fully describe the claimed integer of an air flow generator. With respect, Applicant disagrees. The description describes at page 4 that an air cushion can be provided by an air flow path through the printhead. Air flow generators and flow paths are commonly provided in printheads for clearing nozzles and the like. Generally, the air is directed outwardly of the printhead. Therefore, it would be well understood by the person skilled in the art how to provide an air cushion as described and claimed using the normal air flow generators provided within a printhead.

Claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami. Examiner has stated that Minami teaches all features of claims 1 and 11 with the exception that Minami teaches applying the adhesive to a side edge of the page. With respect, Applicant disagrees. Claims 1 and 11 both require that the provision of an air flow generator for generating an air flow that prevents the pages from contacting the adhesive applicator. This feature is not taught nor suggested by Minami, nor the remaining citations, and accordingly Applicant respectfully submits that the citations, individually or in combination, cannot anticipate the invention defined by independent claims 1 and 11.

As the remaining rejected claims all depend on either claims 1 or 11, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the rejected claims is novel and inventive over Minami and the remaining cited prior art.

Appln No. 10/728,781  
Amdt. Dated August 18, 2004  
Response to Office action of June 22, 2004

5

Applicant submits that this response is fully responsive to each of the issues raised in the Office Action and that each of the issues has been overcome by the amendments and/or remarks made herein. Accordingly, further consideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762